IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) Case No. 4:05-CV-329-GKF-PJC
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,)
Defendants.)

STATE OF OKLAHOMA'S BENCH BRIEF REGARDING THE ADMISSIBILITY OF DOCUMENTS TO DEMONSTRATE NOTICE AND/OR KNOWLEDGE

Plaintiff, the State of Oklahoma ("the State"), hereby submits this bench brief to assist the Court with its evidentiary rulings involving the admissibility of documents to demonstrate notice and/or knowledge. As explained below, when admitted for such a purpose, such documents do not constitute hearsay.

Discussion

It is well settled that documents introduced for the purpose of demonstrating notice and/or actual or constructive knowledge do not constitute hearsay. The Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals' decision in *Marsee v. United States Tobacco Co.*, 866 F.2d 319 (10th Cir. 1989), is particularly instructive. In *Marsee*, an administratrix brought a product liability action against a tobacco company arising out of her son's death allegedly caused by his use of defendant's snuff tobacco products. *Id.* at 321. The trial court had admitted scientific articles submitted by the *plaintiff* (on the issue of notice) that indicated that snuff posed a health threat to users. *Id.* at 325. After such admission, the *defendant* offered countering scientific articles on the issue of notice. *Id.* The trial court permitted their admission as well. *Id.* On appeal, the plaintiff argued that the trial court erred in admitting defendant's series of learned articles on the issue of notice because

they constituted hearsay. *Id.* The Tenth Circuit rejected this argument, concluding that

[t]he hearsay rule is irrelevant in this instance . . . since the articles were not admitted to prove the truth of the matter asserted. Instead, they were admitted on the issue of whether the defendant had notice of the potential dangers its product posed to consumers.

Id. (emphasis added). *Cf. Four Corners Helicopters, Inc. v. Turbomeca, S.A.*, 979 F.2d 1434, 1440 (10th Cir. 1992) (affirming admission of evidence of similar incidents to prove notice).

Although the evidence at issue in *Marsee* were learned articles, that is not a distinction that makes any difference. For example, in *Cook v. Navistar International Transportation Corp.*, 940 F.2d 207 (7th Cir. 1991), the Seventh Circuit applied *Marsee* to *industry publications* and found that such publications – offered to demonstrate actual or constructive knowledge of a reasonably competent design engineer – were improperly excluded as hearsay. *Id.* at 212-13. The Court concluded:

It is true, as plaintiff argues on appeal, that the court should not have excluded the evidence in question as hearsay. The evidence was not offered for the truth of the matter asserted, it was offered to show actual or constructive knowledge and was admissible on that basis.

Id. at 213 (emphasis added).

Numerous other courts have similarly held that documents do not constitute hearsay when relevant to the issue of notice and/or actual or constructive knowledge. *See, e.g., Ricciuti v. New York City Transit Auth.*, 941 F.2d 119, 123 (2d Cir. 1991) ("The reports cited by plaintiffs would not be hearsay if they were offered for the purpose of proving something other than the truth of the matters stated therein, such as whether appellees had notice"), *superseded on other grounds*; *Worsham v. A.H. Robins Co.*, 734 F.2d 676, 686 (11th Cir. 1984); *Kershaw v. Sterling Drug, Inc.*, 415 F.2d 1009, 1011 (5th Cir. 1969) (concluding that medical articles were not hearsay and were properly admitted to show that defendant reasonably should have known of

existence and nature of particular disease); *Williams v. Muhammad's Holy Temple of Islam, Inc.*, No. 00 CV 1251, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7425, at *19-20 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 8, 2006) (denying motion *in limine* to exclude third party correspondence under "well-recognized exception to the hearsay rule" where offered to demonstrate notice); *Buttice v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 938 F. Supp. 561, 565-66 (E.D. Mo. 1996) (concluding that excerpts from medical texts were not hearsay when used to show notice); *LaSalle v. Medco Research, Inc.*, No. 93 C 5381, 93 C 6475, 1996 WL 252474, at *8, 8 n.11 (N.D. Ill. May 10, 1996) (in securities case, publications – including New York Times, Wall Street Journal, and U.S. Today – deemed not hearsay because they were not offered for the truth of the matter asserted therein, but were instead offered to prove plaintiffs' actual or constructive knowledge, i.e., to show that a reasonable person would have had serious concerns as to veracity of predictions for drug's approval); *Huitt v. Market Street Hotel Corp.*, CIV. A. No. 91-1488, 1993 WL 245744, at *7 n.2 (D. Kan. June 10, 1993) ("The statements that McMichael made to Angle are relevant as to the issue of notice, and thus, are not hearsay.") (citing *Marsee*, 866 F.2d at 325).

Respectfully Submitted,

W.A. Drew Edmondson OBA #2628 ATTORNEY GENERAL Kelly H. Foster OBA #17067 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL State of Oklahoma 313 N.E. 21st St. Oklahoma City, OK 73105 (405) 521-3921

M. David Riggs OBA #7583
Joseph P. Lennart OBA #5371
Richard T. Garren OBA #3253
Sharon K. Weaver OBA #19010
Robert A. Nance OBA #6581
D. Sharon Gentry OBA #15641
David P. Page OBA #6852
RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN,
ORBISON & LEWIS
502 West Sixth Street
Tulsa, OK 74119
(918) 587-3161

Louis W. Bullock OBA #1305 Robert M. Blakemore OBA #18656 BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE 110 West Seventh Street, Suite 707 Tulsa, OK 74119 (918) 584-2001

Frederick C. Baker (admitted *pro hac vice*) Elizabeth Claire Xidis (admitted *pro hac vice*) MOTLEY RICE LLC 28 Bridgeside Boulevard Mount Pleasant, SC 29465 (843) 216-9280

/s/ Ingrid L. Moll

William H. Narwold (admitted pro hac vice) Ingrid L. Moll (admitted pro hac vice) Mathew P. Jasinski (admitted pro hac vice) MOTLEY RICE LLC 20 Church Street, 17th Floor Hartford, CT 06103 (860) 882-1678

Jonathan D. Orent (admitted *pro hac vice*) Michael G. Rousseau (admitted *pro hac vice*) Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick (admitted *pro hac vice*) MOTLEY RICE LLC 321 South Main Street Providence, RI 02940 (401) 457-7700

Attorneys for the State of Oklahoma

I hereby certify that on this 19th day of October, 2009, I electronically transmitted the above and foregoing pleading to the Clerk of the Court using the ECF System for filing and a transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General	Fc_docket@oag.ok.gov
Kelly H. Foster, Assistant Attorney General	kelly_foster@oag.ok.gov
M. David Riggs	driggs@riggsabney.com
Joseph P. Lennart	jlennart@riggsabney.com
Richard T. Garren	rgarren@riggsabney.com
Sharon K. Weaver	sweaver@riggsabney.com
Robert A. Nance	rnance@riggsabney.com
D. Sharon Gentry	sgentry@riggsabney.com
David P. Page	dpage@riggsabney.com
RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON &	
Louis Werner Bullock	lbullock@bullock-blakemore.com
Robert M. Blakemore	bblakemore@bullock-blakemore.com
BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE	
Frederick C. Baker	fbaker@motleyrice.com
Elizabeth Claire Xidis	cxidis@motleyrice.com
William H. Narwold	bnarwold@motleyrice.com
Ingrid L. Moll	imoll@motleyrice.com
Jonathan D. Orent	jorent@motleyrice.com
Michael G. Rousseau	mrousseau@motleyrice.com
Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick	ffitzpatrick@motleyrice.com
MOTLEY RICE LLC	
Counsel for State of Oklahoma	
Robert P. Redemann	rredemann@pmrlaw.net
PERRINE, MCGIVERN, REDEMANN, REID, B	ARRY & TAYLOR, P.L.L.C.
David C. Senger	david@cgmlawok.com
Robert E Sanders	rsanders@youngwilliams.com
Edwin Stephen Williams	steve.williams@youngwilliams.com
YOUNG WILLIAMS P.A.	
Counsel for Cal-Maine Farms, Inc and Cal-Maine Foods, Inc.	
John H. Tucker	jtucker@rhodesokla.com

Counsel for Peterson Farms, Inc.

Gary S Chilton	gchilton@hcdattorneys.com	
HOLLADAY, CHILTON AND DEGIUSTI, PLLC		
Counsel for US Chamber of Commerce and American Tort Reform Association		
D. Kenyon Williams, Jr.	kwilliams@hallestill.com	
Michael D. Graves	mgraves@hallestill.com	
HALL, ESTILL, HARDWICK, GABLE, GOLDEN		
Counsel for Poultry Growers/Interested Parties/	Poultry Partners, Inc.	
D' 1 1	11 16 10 1 1	
Richard Ford	richard.ford@crowedunlevy.com	
LeAnne Burnett	leanne.burnett@crowedunlevy.com	
CROWE & DUNLEVY		
Counsel for Oklahoma Farm Bureau, Inc.		
Kendra Akin Jones, Assistant Attorney General	Kendra.Jones@arkansasag.gov	
Charles L. Moulton, Sr Assistant Attorney General	Charles.Moulton@arkansasag.gov	
Counsel for State of Arkansas and Arkansas Nati		
Counsel for State of Alkansas and Alkansas Nat		
Mark Richard Mullins	richard.mullins@mcafeetaft.com	
MCAFEE & TAFT		
Counsel for Texas Farm Bureau; Texas Cattle Fe	eeders Association; Texas Pork Producers	
Association and Texas Association of Dairymen	<u> </u>	
Mia Vahlberg	mvahlberg@gablelaw.com	
GABLE GOTWALS		
James T. Banks	jtbanks@hhlaw.com	
Adam J. Siegel	ajsiegel@hhlaw.com	
HOGAN & HARTSON, LLP		
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Poul	try and Egg Association & National Turkey	
<u>Federation</u>	T	
	1 1001	
John D. Russell	jrussell@fellerssnider.com	
FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY		
& TIPPENS, PC		
XXY'11' A XXY 1.1.11 Y	11 1100	
William A. Waddell, Jr.	waddell@fec.net	
David E. Choate	dchoate@fec.net	

Sara Hill

Counsel for the Cherokee Nation

/s/ Ingrid L. Moll	
Ingrid L. Moll	